

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 20-26 have been rejected, and Claims 11, 14 and 19 have been objected to. Claim 1 has been amended. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 11, 14 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate the elements of the base claims and any intervening claims. However, since the Applicants believe that the remaining claims in this application are patentable, the Applicants have not at this time elected to rewrite Claims 11, 14 and 19 in independent form.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gale (US Patent No. 5,285,407). These rejections are overcome for the following exemplary reasons.

A cited prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single cited prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Independent Claim 22 recites “*loading data representing an image into memory elements in communication with respective light modulation elements; altering ones of the light modulation elements in response to the data loaded thereunto to transfer the image onto a substrate; shifting the data between the memory elements; altering ones of the light modulation elements in response to the data shifted thereunto to transfer the image onto the substrate.*” The Applicants respectfully submit that Gale does not teach (expressly or inherently) this combination of features.

Referring to Gale, Figures 1 and 3, data representing an image is shifted into a shift register 12, then loaded from the shift register 12 into a latch 13, and then transferred from the latch 13 into an array 30 of memory elements 32. The memory elements 32 are in communication with spatial light modulators arranged in an array 10. Gale uses the spatial light modulators to transfer the image from the memory element array 30 onto the desired medium. Gale does not teach transferring the image onto the medium twice, as quoted above from Claim 22. Also, Gale fails to teach shifting the image data between memory elements that are in communication with light modulation elements, as quoted above from Claim 22. More specifically, Gale does not teach any shifting of image data between the memory elements 32. The rejections of Claim 22, and Claims 23-26 which depend therefrom, are overcome in view of the foregoing discussion.

Independent Claim 1, as amended above, recites “*memory elements configured to store data therein and shift data therebetween; and light modulation elements respectively in communication with the memory elements, wherein each of the light modulation elements is alterable in response to data stored in the respectively corresponding memory element.*” The Applicants submit that Gale does not teach (expressly or inherently) this combination of features. As explained above with respect Claim 22, Gale fails to teach shifting data between

memory elements that are in communication with light modulation elements. Accordingly, the rejections of Claim 1, and Claims 2, 6-10, 12, 13, and 15-21 which depend therefrom, are overcome.

For the exemplary reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 102 rejections of Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 20-26.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gale in view of Conner (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,083). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

It is initially noted that the detailed statement of the rejections of Claims 3-5, set forth at Item 4 on Page 5 of the Office Action, does not comply with the MPEP requirements for formulating a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In particular, Item 4 on Page 5 of the Office Action fails to state the differences between the claimed invention and the primary reference Gale, and also fails even to make reference to the content of the secondary reference Conner. Clarification of the § 103 rejections is therefore in order.

Notwithstanding the aforementioned deficiencies in the § 103 rejections of Claims 3-5, in order to expedite prosecution, the Applicants provide for the record the following remarks regarding the § 103 rejections. Claims 3-5 depend ultimately from Claim 1, and therefore include all of the exemplary limitations discussed above with respect to the § 102 rejection of Claim 1. Conner fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Gale with respect to Claim 1, so the § 103 rejections of Claims 3-5 are overcome for at least the same reasons given above with respect to the § 102 rejection of Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 3-5.

IV. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, all Claims in the Application are now believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early allowance of such Claims is respectfully requested.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number or email address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

KEN A. NISHIMURA ET AL

Dated: 5/22/2006

By Holly L. Rudnick
Holly L. Rudnick
Registration No. 43,065

P.O. Box 670007
Dallas, Texas 75367
(Direct) (214) 387-8097
(Fax) (214) 387-7949
(Email) hrudnick@texaspatents.com